



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/521,663

09/22/2005

Simon Wilson

915-011.005

9232

4955 7590 05/04/2007
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS &
ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER

GONZALEZ, AMANCIO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/04/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/521,663	Applicant(s) WILSON, SIMON	
	Examiner Amancio Gonzalez	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 February 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 02/17/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The argued features, i.e., a mobile telephone engine assembly comprising a display and a plurality of switches cover overlying, without an intermediate rigid cover and snugly fitting the engine assembly and comprising an aperture aligned with the display and an integrated keypad, for user input, aligned with a plurality of switches, read on Halkosaari et al. in view of Hsu et al., hereafter "Hsu," as follows.

Halkosaari et al., hereafter Halkosaari, is discussing a user changeable cover for a mobile phone (see par. 0002) without an intermediate rigid cover between the engine assembly and the outer cover –housing- of the phone (see the abstract, fig. 2). As it can be clearly seen in the figure, the cover includes a window –reads on aperture, which aligns with the assembly engine display, as well as an integrated keypad aligned with a plurality of switches (refer to elements 76, 20 and 46 of fig. 2). Although Halkosaari clearly discloses the claimed invention, he does not refer to a flexible cover. Hsu teaches an enclosure for a portable electronic device and a method for making the same, the enclosure having a skin made of soft material such as fabric or leather (see pars. 0007-0009), which would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the aforesaid references to achieve the object and purpose of the invention under consideration, preserving it's objective and concept of clear and defined.

Art Unit: 2617

Therefore, the combination of Halkosaari and Hsu discloses the limitation of "a flexible cover for the engine assembly of a mobile device," consequently also disclosing the limitation of the argued features as stated above.

As a result, the argued features are written such that they read upon the cited references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. **Claims 1-10, 15, 16, and 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halkosaari et al. (US PGPub 20020193136) in view of Hsu et al. (US PGPub 20030083094).

Consider **claim 1, 16 and 20**, Halkosaari et al. show a mobile electronic device providing an engine assembly –reads: telephone circuitry (fig. 1, element 25)-

Art Unit: 2617

comprising a display and switches (fig. 2, elements 44 and 46); and a flexible cover overlying, without an intermediate rigid cover, and snugly fitting the engine assembly and comprising an integrated keypad, for user input, aligned with the plurality of switches (fig. 2). Although Halkosaari et al. do not explicitly show a leather or fabric flexible cover, Hsu et al., in related art, teach a cover for a portable mobile phone made of leather or fabric (pars. 0006 and 0007).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Halkosaari et al. And Hsu et al. in order to provide flexible material for the purpose of producing the cover of a mobile telephone.

Consider **claim 2**, and as applied to claim 1 above, Halkosaari et al., as modified by Hsu et al., show a mobile phone wherein the flexible cover is made from flexible material which defines a cavity for receiving the engine assembly and has an insertion aperture through the material to the cavity through which the engine assembly can fit (insertion aperture for receiving the engine assembly can be seen after top shell 10 and bottom shell 12 of the housing are separated –par 0018; fig. 2).

Consider **claim 3**, and as applied to claim 1 above, Halkosaari et al., as modified by Hsu et al., show a mobile phone comprising means for closing or restricting the insertion aperture after the engine assembly has been inserted (pars. 0016, 0026; figs. 1, 4A and 4B).

Consider **claim 4**, and as applied to claim 1 above, Halkosaari et al., as modified by Hsu et al., show a mobile wherein the flexible cover comprises an aperture aligned with the display (display interface 16 is shown as a substantially clear port 76, which is aligned with the assembly engine display –par 0020; fig. 2).

Consider **claim 5**, and as applied to claim 1 above, Halkosaari et al. do not explicitly show a plurality of fabric or leather portions attached to the substrate and/or each other. However, Hsu et al., in related art, teach an enclosure that can be made of fabric or leather (par 0009).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Halkosaari et al. and Hsu et al. in order to provide flexible material that can be attached to the cover of a mobile telephone.

Consider **claim 6**, and as applied to claim 1 above, Halkosaari et al., as modified by Hsu et al., show an overlapping portion on the cover (fig. 4B, element 150).

Consider **claim 7**, and as applied to claim 1 above, Halkosaari et al., as modified by Hsu et al., show wherein portions of the underlying substrate of the mobile phone are exposed (the power interface, as part of the underlying substrate is exposed through an opening in the bottom of the cover –see fig. 2, elements 22, and 54).

Consider **claim 8**, and as applied to claim 1 above, Halkosaari et al., as modified by Hsu et al., show wherein the integrated keypad has a plurality of key portions on an exterior surface of the flexible cover and a plurality of corresponding projections on the

interior surface of the flexible cover, each of said projections being arranged to actuate one of the plurality of switches of the engine assembly (par 0015; fig. 2).

Consider **claim 9**, and as applied to claim 1 above, Halkosaari et al., as modified by Hsu et al., show wherein the flexible cover and the engine assembly have corresponding projections and receptacles for aligning the flexible cover correctly with the engine assembly (par. 0018; fig. 2).

Consider **claim 10**, and as applied to claim 1 above, Halkosaari et al. do not explicitly show wherein the flexible cover is made from fabric, elastically deformable material, or leather. Hsu et al., however, in related art, teach a flexible cover for a mobile phone made of fabric or leather.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Halkosaari et al. and Hsu et al. in order to choose a flexible material for the purpose of producing a type of cover for a mobile telephone.

Consider **claim 15**, and as applied to claim 1 above, Halkosaari et al., as modified by Hsu et al., show wherein the flexible cover of a mobile telephone is user replaceable (par 0002; figs. 2, 4A, and 4B).

4. Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halkosaari et al. (US PGPub 20020193136) in view of Hsu et al. (US PGPub 20030083094) further in view of Mitchel (US Pat 6082535).

Consider **claim 11**, and as applied to claim 1 above, Halkosaari et al., as modified by Hsu et al., do not explicitly show wherein the flexible cover is substantially formed from one-piece of material. Mitchel, however, in related art, shows a mobile phone cover made of a single piece (col. 1, lines 43-49, figs. 1-3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Halkosaari et al., Hsu et al., and Mitchel in order to provide a simpler, one-piece material, cover for a mobile telephone.

Consider **claim 13**, and as applied to claim 1 above, Halkosaari et al., as modified by Hsu et al., do not explicitly show wherein the flexible cover for a mobile telephone has an elastic and waterproof substrate adjacent the engine assembly. Mitchel, however, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a protective waterproof cover permanently adhered to the substrate of the engine assembly (col. 3, lines 44-47, 60-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Halkosaari et al., Hsu et al., and Mitchel in order to provide an impermeable protective sealing to cover the electronic circuits under the removable flexible cover of a mobile telephone.

5. **Claim 14** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halkosaari et al. (US PGPub 20020193136) in view of Hsu et al. (US PGPub 20030083094) further in view of Tseng et al. (US PGPub 20020027768).

Art Unit: 2617

Consider **claim 14**, and as applied to claim 1 above, Halkosaari et al., as modified by Hsu et al., do not explicitly show wherein the flexible cover for a mobile telephone has a molded elastomer substrate adjacent the engine assembly. Tseng et al., however, in related art, teaches an elastomer cover molded on an electronic mobile device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Halkosaari et al., Hsu et al., and Tseng et al in order to provide a suitable protective material adhered to the substrate contiguous to the rigid enclosure of the electronic circuits of a mobile telephone.

New Grounds of Rejection

6. **Claims 12** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halkosaari et al. (US PGPub 20020193136) in view of Hsu et al. (US PGPub 20030083094), as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of Badillo et al. (US Pat 6729518).

Consider **claim 12**, Halkosaari, as modified by Hsu, teaches claim 1 above, but does not particularly refer to a cell phone cover with overlapping members or limbs. Badillo discloses cell phone covers with overlapping members or limbs (see abstract and figs. 1-14). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Halkosaari and Hsu and have it include a cell phone cover with overlapping members or limbs, as taught by Badillo,

Art Unit: 2617

thereby providing means for conveniently protecting handheld electronic devices, as discussed by Badillo (see col. 1 lines 15-67 and col. 2 lines 1-14).

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment to claim 12 necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection, particularly applied to the aforesaid claim, presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

8. Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed**
to: Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Delaney Street

Art Unit: 2617

Alexandria, VA 22314

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Amnion Gonzalez, whose telephone number is (571) 270-1106. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30am to 5:00pm.


If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Nick Corsaro can be reached at (571) 272-7876. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Amancio González
AG/ag

April 30, 2007


NICK CORSARO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600